

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/889,558	07/27/2001	Charles Leroux	7670	
22850 75	90 . 11/04/2003		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			SCHILLINGER, LAURA M	
1940 DUKE ST ALEXANDRIA			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	.,		2813	3
	•	•	, DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Ale
Advisory Action	09/889,558	LEROUX, CHARLES	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laura M Schillinger	2813	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addres	s
THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendment ppeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to	a n in
PERIOD FO	R REPLY [check either a) or t	)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date o no event, however, will the statutory period for reply e ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f).	f this Advisory Action, or (2) the date expire later than SIX MONTHS from the WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	e mailing date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See	e MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a) ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the purpose of determining the de	eriod of extension and the correspond ate of the shortened statutory period to be Office later than three months after	ling amount of the fee. The appropri or reply originally set in the final Office	iate extension ce action; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appel</li> <li>CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37)</li> </ol>			
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter</li></ol>	ed because:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see N	ote below);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application</li><li>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tion in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or simpli	ifying the
(d) they present additional claims without ca	inceling a corresponding numb	per of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following r	reiection(s):		,
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w     canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	· ' ' ———	in a separate, timely filed am	endment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NOT p	lace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	I because it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which were ne	ewly
<ol> <li>For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clain</li> </ol>			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to MINE			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-17</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18-20			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a)  approved or b) □	disapproved by the Examiner	, •
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stat	ement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)./	, 4
10. Other:	, ,	Earl Olhitahera	K .
		CARL WHITEHEAD JR. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600	r.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant is merely reciting the repetition of duplicate parts which the courts have held to have no patentable significance unless a new or unexpected result is produced see In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).